

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

VS.

STANLEY CORNELL,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 1:03-CR-00431-2

ORDER

[Resolving Doc. Nos. [292](#); [395](#)]

JAMES S. GWIN, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE:

Pro se petitioner Stanley Cornell has filed motions for discovery in furtherance of his [28 U.S.C. § 2255](#) petition for relief. [Docs. [292](#); [395](#)]. The Government has responded to Cornell’s discovery requests. If Cornell believes that the Governments’s response is insufficient, then he must file a new motion under [Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 37](#). That Rule 37 motion must identify (1) a specific description of the additional discovery Cornell seeks and (2) a specific justification for that additional discovery. Accordingly, the Court **DENIES AS MOOT** Cornell’s motion to compel, [Doc. [292](#)]; **DENIES** Cornell’s motion for in-camera review; and **DENIES AS MOOT** the discovery request, [Doc. [395](#)].

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 17, 2012

s/ James S. Gwin  
JAMES S. GWIN  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE